REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-94 are pending. Claims 1, 26, 49, and 74 are amended. FIG. 3 is amended to correct a typographical error, that is changing the reference numeral 25 to 27. Specification is also amended to correct typographical errors.

The Examiner states that claims 4 and 6 appear to contradict each other as to what a data pump does and where it outputs to. (Office action, page 3, middle of the first paragraph). Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 4 is dependent on claim 3 and claim 6 is dependent on claim 4. Claim 3 recites "the data exchange [of claim 1] comprises a data pump capable of demodulating the data signals from the network line." Claim 4 recites "the data exchange [of claim 1] comprises a jitter buffer capable of receiving packets of the data signals of varying delay from the packet based network and compensating for the delay variation of the data signal packets" and claim 6 recites "wherein the data pump [of claim 3] transmits the received data signals to the network line at a transmit rate.

Therefore, in claim 4, it is the jitter buffer of data exchange that is "capable of receiving packets of the data signals of varying delay from the packet based network and compensating for the delay variation of the data signal packets." However, in claim 6, it is the data pump that "transmits the received data signals to the network line at a transmit rate."

Claims 1-7, 9-12, 18, 20, 25-32, 34-37, 43, 45, 49, 54, 57-59, 61-62, 64, 70-78, 81-83, 85-86, 88, and 93-94 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Shoo (US 6,304,574). Claims 8, 13-17, 19, 21-24, 38-42, 47-48, 55-56, 65-69, 79-80, 89-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoo in view if Foltan (US 6,667,972) or Chen (6,611,531). In view of the above amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, therefore, reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Independent claim 1 includes, among other limitations, "a full duplex data exchange for exchanging data signals from the network line with data signals from the packet based network, wherein the full duplex data exchange demodulates the data signals from the network line and outputs the demodulated data signals to the packet based network, and wherein the full duplex data exchange remodulates the demodulated data signals from the packet based network and outputs the remodulated data signals to the network line."

Applicants respectfully submit that Shoo does not disclose the above-recited limitation. Rather Schoo discloses a method and apparatus for distributing protocol processing among a plurality of computing platforms. As shown in FIG. 1A "a call originates from a computer, such as a PC 20, which sends data via a Data Communications Equipment (DCE) (such as modem M) onto telephone network 50 or other communications link to a receiving DCE 10, such as a modem. The call originating data terminal 20 has communication software that uses a communications protocol, such as PPP or SLIP. The DCE 10 demodulates the call from the personal computer 20 and passes it over a transmission means 11,

for example an RS 232 cable or packet bus, to a router or terminal server 12. The router or terminal server 12 passes the call onto a network or host computer system for example a personal computer (not shown in FIG. 1A)." (Col. 6, lines 23-34, and FIG. 1A).

There is no disclosure in Schoo about "a full duplex data exchange for exchanging data signals from the network line with data signals from the packet based network, wherein the full duplex data exchange demodulates the data signals from the network line and outputs the demodulated data signals to the packet based network, and wherein the full duplex data exchange remodulates the demodulated data signals from the packet based network and outputs the remodulated data signals to the network line," as recited in independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Schoo and thus is allowable over the cited references. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 2-25 that depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 are allowable as is claims 1 and for additional limitations recited therein.

Independent claim 26 includes, among other limitations, "a full duplex data exchange for exchanging data signals from a second telephony device with demodulated data signals from the packet based network, wherein the full duplex data exchange demodulates the data signals from the first telephony device and outputs the demodulated data signals to the packet based network, and wherein the full duplex data exchange remodulates the demodulated data signals from the packet based network and

outputs the remodulated data signals to the first telephony device."

As discussed above, there is no disclosure in Schoo about "a full duplex data exchange" which "remodulates the demodulated data signals from the packet based network and outputs the remodulated data signals to the first telephony device."

Accordingly, independent claim 26 is not anticipated by Schoo and thus is allowable over cited references. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 27-48 that depend directly or indirectly from claim 26 are allowable as is claims 26 and for additional limitations recited therein. Independent claim 49 includes, among other limitations, "remodulating the demodulated data signals from the packet based network for inputting to the network line," and "simultaneously exchanging the remodulated data signals from the network line with demodulated data signals from the packet based network."

As discussed above, Schoo does not disclose "remodulating the demodulated data signals from the packet based network for inputting to the network line," and "simultaneously exchanging the remodulated data signals from the network line with demodulated data signals from the packet based network," as recited by the independent claim 49. Consequently, independent claim 49 is not anticipated by Schoo and thus is allowable over the cited references. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 50-73 that depend directly or indirectly from claim 49 are allowable as is claims 49 and for additional limitations recited therein.

Independent claim 74 includes, among other limitations, "demodulating data signals from the first telephony device for inputting to the packet based network," "remodulating the demodulated data signals from the packet based network," and "simultaneously exchanging the remodulated data signals from a second telephony device with demodulated data signals from the packet based network."

Again, Schoo does not disclose ""remodulating the demodulated data signals from the packet based network," and "simultaneously exchanging the remodulated data signals from a second telephony device with demodulated data signals from the packet based network," as recited by the independent claim 74. Therefore, independent claim 74 is not anticipated by Schoo and thus is allowable over the cited references. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 75-94 that depend directly or indirectly from claim 74 are allowable as is claims 74 and for additional limitations recited therein.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

Βv

Raymond R. Tabandeh Reg. No. 43,945

626/795-9900

CLV PAS569954.1-*-06/15/04 11:16 AM



FIG. 2



